

Vermont
Part C: Early Intervention Program of the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Annual Performance Report
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006
July 2006 through June 2007

Table of Contents for Vermont FFY 2006 APR

Monitoring priorities and their indicators	Begins on page
Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments:	
Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers who received their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	8
Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily received early intervention services in their home or programs for typically developing children.	12
Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language –communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	14
Indicator 4: Percent of families in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.	17
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision	
Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to: A. Other states with similar eligibility; and B. National data.	23
Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs compared to: A. Other states with similar eligibility; and B. National data.	25
Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45 day timeline.	27
Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	30
Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	34
Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	42
Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.	43

Monitoring priorities and their indicators	Begins on page
Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).	44
Indicator 13: Percent of mediations that resulted in mediation agreements.	45
Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	46
Table 4: 10-13 Table on complaint resolution.	47

Vermont Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006 (reporting period 7/1/06 through 6/30/07)

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

During this FFY 2006 reporting period, July 2006 through June 2007, the Leadership Team of the Child Development Division (CDD), the Vermont Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC), Regional Early Intervention Program (regional EIP) Directors and Supervisors (called Host Agency Directors), the Early Education Team of the State Department of Education, which includes the Part B 619 coordinator, have had extensive and ongoing involvement in the development and discussion of the FFY 2006 Annual Performance Report (APR) for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 and Vermont's Part C State Performance Plan (SPP). This involvement included discussion of the monitoring priorities/expected outcomes, indicators, measurement requirements, data collection and analysis/discussion, progress and slippage discussions and input regarding program improvement strategies.

Prior to and during this time period the CDD has planned and partially implemented a child development and family support services system that uses Part C (in Vermont referred to as the Family, Infant and Toddler Program - FITP) as the foundation for a prenatal to school age set of prevention, early intervention and treatment services. This support services system integrates three programs under one umbrella, which is called Children's Integrated Services (CIS). This integration was initiated during the reorganization of the Vermont Agency of Human Services (AHS) in 2004 – 2005. Developing CIS has been and is a priority for the CDD as it was untenable to have the three programs continue as separate "silo" programs in the same division. These three programs include the Part C/FITP, a health based family support program and an early childhood and family mental health program. The intended result will be a holistic, family centered set of services that is inclusive of health, early childhood and family mental health and Part C/Early Intervention and produces positive outcomes for children and families

While procedural safeguards are a priority for all families eligible for Part C/FITP services, there are many best practices in the Part C system in Vermont (and nationally) that benefit the other service systems Vermont is integrating. For example, child find, information and referral, multidisciplinary assessment/evaluations, individualized planning of outcomes and strategies, transition planning, family centered services, etc. are features that will be applicable beyond the birth to three Part C system to the early childhood integrated services system.

Numerous meetings and presentations have occurred throughout the reporting year regarding CIS issues and, in a more focused manner, regarding Part C's program assessment and improvement activities. Efforts made by Part C on continuous program improvement provided the framework for the CIS continuous quality improvement system. These activities were based on APR data (2005) as reported by the regional EIPs. Notably, for the first time the APR data were posted to the CDD web site (cddvt.org).

This FFY 2006 Annual Performance Report used the SPP as the baseline for discussing targets, progress and slippage, and activities for improvement with all of the groups mentioned in the first paragraph. Throughout the year, the revised SPP and the FFY 2005 APR have been posted to agency web sites and hard copies have been disseminated to constituency groups to be used at various meetings. Intensive discussions (during training and technical assistance sessions planned jointly with the Department of Education and regional EIPs) have been held regarding timeliness of services, the role of partners in timely evaluations and initial IFSP meetings, child and family outcomes, transition, correction of non-compliance, and monitoring systems. Vermont also took advantage of the North East Regional Resource Center's (NERRC)

technical assistance on a number of issues, including transition and data systems. The state also engaged the OSEP program officer, OSEP sponsored technical assistance calls, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center technical assistance, and resources provided by the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center and other Regional Resource Center (NCSEAM) support.

In November of 2006 and 2007, the VICC spent a day and a half in their annual planning meeting focusing on the issues outlined in the Annual Performance Report. Since the VICC is a major “stakeholder” and has a vested interest in quality services, they have served as an important group to oversee the development of the APR. At monthly meetings of the VICC Executive Committee as well as quarterly meetings of the whole Council, issues related to the APR are always on the agenda. The group is well educated about the Part C/FITP program and its requirements and expected benefits. Several meetings also occurred with the regional EIP Host Agency Directors and supervisory staff and the staff of Part B-619 to discuss the data analysis, public reporting and determinations. For the transition indicators, the APR findings were reviewed, and collaborative technical assistance and training occurred. Also, a statewide transition conference was held in March 2007. More than 120 people from Part C and Part B-619 programs came together to review transition issues and have the opportunity to clarify regulations and practices. This intensive effort continues in the FFY 2007.

Vermont completed its regional EIP determinations after reviewing the data for FFY 2005 and discussing the data in meetings and in region to state phone conferences. Then the regional data for FFY 2005 were reported to the public on the web sites in the summer of 2007. We plan to distribute and discuss the regional data for the 2006 APR indicators at the March 2008 regional EIP Host Agency Directors’ meeting and the March meeting of the VICC.

We will be reviewing the FFY 2006 APR data in order to best present it in a manner that is understandable to the families and the general public (public reporting), specifically focusing on how the data relate to the operations and outcomes of the regional early intervention programs. We will post the APR and the regional data to the Agency of Human Services, Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division’s web site as well as to the Vermont Parent Information Center’s web site. When the FFY 2006 APR and the data for public reporting are posted, we will use various methods to communicate to the parenting and family organizations, health care professionals and the general public that the data are available.

Overall Vermont has improved significantly from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006, with problem areas still found in meeting Indicator 7, the 45 day timelines, and in correcting findings of non-compliance within 12 months of identification (mostly now related to Indicator 7). It is likely that the timelines will change with the new Part C federal regulations; and if so, the state will be in compliance. Important to note is the increase in caseload, workload and federal documentation requirements that pressure the work of the regional EIPs that are faced with contextual, local – community resource issues. The CDD, in preparing regional EIP budgets for FFY 2007, took into consideration the challenges facing the EIPs and did increase the resources available to them as well as worked on other improvement strategies noted in this APR.

Two additional factors are notable. First is the collaboration between two divisions in the same department related to two federal laws: the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Act of 2004) and the CAPTA (Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act). There were 48 infants and toddlers who became eligible for Part C/FITP who had a substantiated case of child abuse and/or neglect on 12/1/06 (about one third of referrals). Second, prior to 10/31/07, Part C/FITP played a significant role with families and services providers in helping to identify 64 children under the age of three with a diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), most of whom did

not enter the program with a diagnosis. There were 31 children with “active” IFSPs who had a diagnosis of ASD on 12/1/06. Between Vermont’s Part B-619 and Part C, about 1 child in 150 children is identified with ASD and receiving intensive services. The workload associated with serving children with multiple and intense needs has dramatically increased along with the caseload.

Based on the work described in this FFY 2006 APR, the State Performance Plan has been revised in several areas. Below is a listing of the indicators and summary of changes.

Revisions due to OSEP on 4-14-08 are submitted as an “opportunity to clarify or correct data” reported in Vermont’s FFY 2006 SPP/APR. Vermont has highlighted all revisions made in yellow.

Indicator 1, Timely Services: No revisions.

Indicator 2, Natural Environments: The performance target of 97% is changed to 94% for FFY 2006 to FFY 2010, when it is changed to 95% in the revised SPP.

Indicator 3, Child Outcomes: Progress reporting for child outcomes is in the revised SPP along with improvement activities that extend through FFY 2010.

Indicator 4, Family outcomes: Targets for return rate are revised to 30% from 35% in the SPP for FFY 2006 to FFY 2010, when it becomes 31%.

Outcome 4 A = no revisions

Outcome 4 B = no revisions

Outcome 4 C = SPP revised to 85% from 88%; revised again to 88.1%.

Indicator 5, Child find for infants under age one: There is one revision in the SPP that revises the wording in the second improvement activity to state “regions below the target” from “regional EIPs below state average” from FFY 2006 through FFY 2010.

Indicator 6, Child find for children birth to three: The revision to the SPP changes the wording in the first Improvement Activity deleting two categories of proposed reporting (category of eligibility and referral sources).

Indicator 7, Child Find 45 Day timeline: The only change to the SPP is a revision that now reports a statewide measure instead of separate regional ones.

Indicator 8, Transition: No SPP revisions.

Indicator 9, General Supervision, Timely Correction of Findings: Improvement activity 9 revised to delete the word “Consider.” Vermont added one improvement activity at the end, “Engage Federal and other Technical Assistance Centers (e.g. NERRC, NECTAC) to support this work.”

Indicator 10-13, Procedural safeguards: No revisions.

Indicator 14: Timely and accurate reporting: No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with individualized family service plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100. Account for untimely receipt of services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 627/679 = 92.34%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006:

In Vermont for the first time in FFY 2006 all children with active IFSPs were included in the data collection and analysis for Indicator 1 as we shifted from selected file reviews (125 in 2004 and again in 2005) to the child count data base. There has been significant progress from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006, increasing from 86% in 2005 to 92% compliance in FFY 2006. This represents an almost 6% increase over FFY 2005.

Of the 679 children with active IFSPs in the data review, 627 received services within 30 days of their parents' signed consent for IFSP services. Included in the 627 were 64 children who had family circumstances that were beyond the control of the early intervention program and who did not have services begin within 30 days of consent for services. There were 52 children whose services were not initiated within 30 days of consent and their reasons did not have to do with child or family circumstances. The main reasons cited for this non-compliance included the lack of specific early intervention personnel – primarily speech and language (57% of reasons cited for late services) and occupational therapists (21% of reason cited for late services).

These data were reviewed by the state staff as well as by staff in regional EIPs who verified reasons for not meeting the initiation of services requirements by reviewing child count forms and actual files for documentation. For FFY 2007 Vermont will again be collecting and reporting

data on each child and the initiation of each service in its annual child count data collection. The data collection forms require an explanation when any service is not initiated within the 30 days from consent timeline. The possible explanations include specific child and family circumstances such as illness or hospitalization, family wishing to delay services and explanations that have to do with non-family reasons. Each regional EIP's data are reviewed by a central office staff member and as questions arise, the central office staff person verifies the answers with the regional EIP staff and, if necessary, makes corrections on the data forms and to the MS Access data base.

As mentioned earlier, there has been significant progress from 2005 to 2006, going from 86% to 92%. Eleven of the twelve regional programs maintained or achieved significant progress. One program from 2004 showed improvement but has not yet met the rigorous target set by OSEP. This regional EIP serves an area that has very significant challenges due to its poverty; rural isolation; and lack of health care, family support, and early intervention providers. The ongoing non-compliance has primarily been due to a lack of speech and language and occupational therapists, who not are willing to provide services on a regular basis in such a remote and challenging area. Because this regional EIP moved to a new agency in July of 2006 the state FITP staff has been working with this region intensively, monthly or more on-site visits. The state and region continue to address the needs for timely speech and language and occupational therapy.

For this particular regional EIP Host Agency (that demonstrate ongoing non-compliance in several Indicators) over a three year period, we have decided to provide incentives, including intensive technical assistance. During the FFY 2005, the Host Agency for this regional EIP changed after having intensive support and then programmatic sanctions. A request for proposals was announced, resulting in a new Host Agency effective 7/1/06.

Based on the intense implementation of the improvement activities described in the grid below, two other regional EIPs that had continuing non-compliance from FFY 2004, came into compliance in FFY 2006.

Also, in FFY 2005 the two regional EIPs that were identified as non-compliant came into compliance in FFY 2006.

In FFY 2006, there are no new findings of non-compliance, and all except one region have come into compliance.

Program Improvement Activities taken from the SPP with notes for FFY 2006:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Procedure clarification/forms changed (service grid of IFSP and monthly data report to state office includes this data element)	By 1/06	State Staff	Date services to begin changed to date initial service did begin, and must begin within 30 days of IFSP meeting/family consent for services. This activity has been implemented.

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Disseminate, inform staff; ICC, partners especially schools and any partners doing service coordination	By 1/06 and ongoing	State staff	Follow up with data management system; host agency director's conference calls; professional development events. This activity has and continues to be implemented.
File reviews as part of host agency monitoring	Spring of 2006 and ongoing through FFY 2010	Team of cross agency staff, providers, families, who comprise the monitoring team	File reviews were conducted including file reviews of regional EIPs in October and November of 2007.
Ongoing analysis of new actives monthly data submissions by regions	Ongoing beginning January 2006 through FFY 2010	State staff	Develop ongoing "reporting" for each region and statewide – maximize use of monthly data reports. This activity has and continues to be implemented.
Regional resource/personnel issues addressed through annual budgeting and planning process	Ongoing beginning January 2006 through FFY 2010	State staff and partners in professional development	For the one region that has continuing non-compliance, but demonstrates significant improvement, the budget and personnel were increased to assist them. This activity has and continues to be implemented.
New data management system phased in, real time analysis statewide and regional in place.	Spring of 2006 ongoing and through 2007; with improvements ongoing through FFY 2010	University, Part C staff and Child Development Division and staff	We are continuing to work on full implementation of this activity.
Work closely with Vermont Association of Speech and Language Pathologists to address shortages	December 2006 and ongoing through FFY 2010	State FITP staff, community partners and SLP professional association	State staff member attend state wide meetings with Vermont Association of Speech and Language Pathologists, Department of Education staff, University of Vermont faculty members to address shortages.
Continue to work with State Department of Education on State Improvement Grant and other personnel prep and development resources on recruiting, training and	Ongoing January 2007-2010	Staff FITP staff and DOE staff	This activity has and continues to be implemented.

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
maintaining pediatric SLP's and other key personnel.			
Continue to seek resources in the SLP – Communication fields to work with FITP staff and families.	Ongoing January 2007-2010	State FITP staff, community partners, University of Vermont and SLP professional association	This activity has and continues to be implemented.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2006. There are no revisions for Indicator 1 for the SPP.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs) x 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)	94%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 653/679 = 96.17% these data were reported in October of 2007 for use in the “618” data and are based on Vermont’s 12/1/06 child count data base.

	# Active 12/1/06	# Natural Environments	% Natural Environments	Service Provider location
State Totals	679	653	96%	26=4%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

In FFY 2005 the data from the “618” (data for OSEP’s report to Congress) report showed 98% of children with active IFSPs received services in natural environments (601/615). Of those 601 children, 461 of them received services primarily in their homes and 140 received services primarily with typically developing children in a community setting. The remaining 14 children, 2%, were served at the Service Provider Location with the support for that decision coming from the IFSP team.

In FFY 2006 the data from the “618” (data for OSEP’S report to Congress) report showed 96% of children with active IFSPs received services in natural environments. In the 2006 data, 679 children had active IFSPs, with 653 children receiving services primarily in natural

environments. Of those 653 children, 549 of them received services primarily in their homes and 103 received services primarily with typically developing children in a community setting, such as an early education and care program or Early Head Start program. The remaining 26 children, 4%, were served in a service provider location with the support for that decision coming from the IFSP team. Therefore this 4% is not out of compliance as they meet regulatory standards. Vermont was below our target by 1% for the 2006 reporting year.

One region has a proportionately higher number of children receiving early intervention services at the Service Provider Location. Although documentation is included in family files that the IFSP team supported the location of service provision (clinic setting), the state and regional staff continue to work in this region to expand opportunities for families to receive services in the home or in community settings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2006. Due to the changes in the 2004 IDEA and communications with OSEP, it appears that Vermont targets are relatively high and the state wants to account for additional children whose families/IFSP team decides that services would be more appropriate for the child to happen in locations other than the home or community. Therefore this SPP performance target of 97% is changed to 94% for FFY 2006 to FFY 2010 to 95%.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication);
and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and$

toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 (reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)	Baseline data will be reported in SPP in FFY 2010.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: Progress data are reported for FFY 2006 in the revised SPP, as well as several changes in improvement strategies. Targets and baseline data are not available until the APR of 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006. See above.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2006. Progress data are reported for FFY 2006 in the revised SPP, as well as changes in improvement strategies. Targets and baseline data are not available until the APR of FFY 2010.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	Rate of return 35%; SPP revised to 30% Outcome 4 A = 80%; SPP no revisions. Outcome 4 B = 85%; SPP no revisions. Outcome 4 C = 88%; SPP revised to 85%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: Based on the returns from the May 2007 Early Childhood Outcomes Center Family Outcomes Survey, the results are as follows: Outcome A = 83%, Outcome B = 85% and Outcome C = 87%. Parental rights increased (Outcome A), communicating effectively about their child stayed the same (Outcome B) and helping their

children develop and learn decreased negligibly (Outcome C). While the overall return rate increased from 30 to 34%, Vermont fell just short of its self-proclaimed target of 35% in last year's SPP. To address this, there are revisions to the SPP targets for FFY 2006 – 2010.

Table 1: Percentage/Number of Statewide Survey Returns for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006

Family Outcomes	Number of Responses (Percentage of total distributed)	
	2005 (N=201)	2006 (N=223)
Outcome A: Know their rights	201 (30.3% of 663)	222 (34.10% of 651)
Outcome B: Effectively communicate their children's needs	200 (30.1% of 663)	222 (34.10% of 651)
Outcome C: Help their children develop and learn	200 (30.1% of 663)	221 (33.9% of 651)

Table 2: Characteristics of Families Who Responded to the Survey

Characteristics	2005	2006
Child's Average Age	26 months	27.6 months
Time in Program		
Less than 1 year	62%	51%
12 to 24 months	25%	34%
24 to 36 months	13%	14%
Number of reasons for services		
1 reason	74%	50%
2 reasons	13%	18%
3 or more reasons	13%	33%
<i>Communication only</i>	33%	30%

Table 3: Percentage/Number of Positive Responses to Three Family Survey Questions ¹

Early intervention services have helped their family:*	Number of families in agreement		Percentage of families in agreement	
	2005 (N=201)	2006 (N=223)	2005	2006
A. Know their rights	160/201	184/222	80%	83%
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	169/200	188/222	85%	85%
C. Help their children develop and learn	176/200	192/221	88%	87%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Out of 651 surveys distributed by the state, 223 (34%) were returned in the spring of 2007, which is a slightly higher rate than the previous year's return rate of 30%. Vermont decided to maintain the target response rate for the state and individual regional EIPs at 30 percent based on feedback from OSEP. This target was established so that all regional EIPs have a minimum of ten responses to ensure family anonymity. Over time this rate of return will also increase the likelihood that survey results represent the families served. The response rate for regional EIPs ranged from 19% to 53%. Ten of twelve regional EIPs had a return rate at or above 30%; five met or exceeded the unrealistically high 2006 target return rate of 35%. While four regional EIPs fell below the target return rate in 2005 they improved in 2006. In addition, based on the analysis of the FFY 2005 data from the Family Survey, the FITP state staff and the VICC created a brochure for families and staff of REGIONAL EIPs that described why Part C/FITP needed to have child and family outcomes data collected and the purposes of the data collection. The brochure was available to families in the spring of 2007 during the FFY 2006 reporting period.

A positive response to each of the three survey questions was defined by a rating of 5 or above and interpreted as "Families who report that early intervention services helped their families." (See footnote 1). Statewide, families responded to all three questions very positively (83%, 85% and 87% respectively). These percentages were slightly higher than last year's (80%, 81% and 86% respectively). Of the two regional EIPs that had ratings lower than the state target across all three outcomes in 2005, one region reached the state target in two out of the three outcomes in 2006. Length of time in program and number of reasons for services did not have an apparent impact on family ratings of outcomes in FFY 2006. The statewide and regional target for positive response to each survey question has been revised in the SPP for FFY 2006 through 2010.

¹ **Criterion for defining "Families who report that early intervention services have helped their family":** The rating scale for ECO's Family Outcome Survey ranges from 1 to 7 with 1 to 3 representing a 'poor' to 'fair' job by the early intervention program and 5 to 7 representing a 'good' to 'excellent' job by the early intervention program. Responses of 5 or above were defined as 'families who report that early intervention services helped their families'.

For Outcome A, 83% (184/222) of the families who responded reported that early intervention services had helped their families know their rights. The average statewide response was 5.5, ranging from 4.7 to 6 for the regional EIPs. The percentage of families responding positively to this outcome ranged from 67% to 100% for individual regional EIPs, with four of the regional EIPs falling below the state target this year as compared with seven regional EIPs in 2005. One of the difficulties in interpreting the data is that there is a low response rate for three of the regional EIPs ("N" is less than or equal to 10), with one region having only six responses. In this situation, a single response can create a significant difference in outcome. Comments on the family surveys and the results of the initial Family Forums that were part of on-site monitoring were analyzed to inform the state about more in-depth regional needs regarding this issue.

For Outcome B, 85% (188/222) of the families across the state reported that early intervention services had helped them to effectively communicate their children's needs. The average statewide response was 5.7, ranging from 4.2 to 6.5 for the regional EIPs. The percentage of families responding positively to this outcome ranged from 70% to 100% for individual regional EIPs. In 2006, results from two of the 12 regional EIPs fell slightly below the state's target of 80%, compared with three regional EIPs in 2005. In the two regional EIPs with percentages lower than the state's target, family comments provided additional explanation for the lower scores. Families indicated that their child's development/needs were not an issue (two comments) or that the family did not understand the outcome (one comment). A change in a single response for each of these regional EIPs would bring their percentages to 'at or above' the state's 80% target.

Outcome C had the highest positive response from families overall. Statewide, 87% (192/221) of the families who responded reported that early intervention services had helped them help their children develop and learn. The average statewide response was 5.8, ranging from 4.8 to 6.3 for the regional EIPs. The percentage of families responding positively to this outcome ranged from 70% to 100% for individual regional EIPs, with two regional EIPs falling below the state target as compared to three regional EIPs in 2006. Similar to Outcome 2, the effect of a single rating on a low "N" was apparent and affected whether regional EIPs met the state's target.

Verification of the family survey came from two sources: (1) comments solicited on the survey itself and (2) Family Focus Forums held during the monitoring process. The comments written on the surveys were analyzed. Out of 223 surveys returned to the state, 120 families wrote a comment (54%). Of these, seven were neutral and were subtracted from the total. Of the remaining 113, 102 (90%) were positive, eight (7%) indicated areas of growth and three (3%) had a combination of both positive and negative feedback.

To date, Family Focus Forums addressing Outcome A of the Family Survey have been conducted at the two community reviews/on-site monitoring sessions held this year. A list of guiding questions has been developed and piloted at these sites, is currently under revision and will address all three outcomes. From the Family Focus Forums, it was clear that families felt that they were informed of their family rights and had received ongoing reminders. However, families reported that they would like more time during the course of intervention spent on explaining rights.

The following activities were conducted to increase the survey's rate of return, to disseminate information about the purposes of the survey, and to verify the results of the survey:

- A brochure was developed to describe the purpose, goals and procedures for gathering child and family outcomes. The brochure was distributed to families along with Family Outcome surveys and mailed to all service providers in spring, 2007.

- Service providers are notified in the month prior to the survey mailing so they can alert families to the mailing and answer family questions regarding the survey.
- Targets are set for each region regarding the minimum number of returned surveys needed in order to maintain 30% return rate. Regional EIPs are notified if they do not reach their target to remind service coordinators/providers to encourage families to reply to the survey.
- A state contact and phone number/email address was identified for family questions regarding the survey and to offer the option of a family response via telephone.
- In an effort to verify the results of the family survey, Family Focus Forums are held during the regional monitoring process that address questions related to each of the three survey outcomes. The purposes of this process are to validate survey findings, help interpret survey results, understand the specific needs of a region and guide technical assistance and training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2005. The revised SPP changes the targets for Indicator 4 and its sub-indicators B and C for FFY 2006 to FFY 2010, when it will become 31% because the statewide rate of return of 30% is a respected rate of return for surveys.

May 2007 Family Survey:

The Family Infant and Toddler Program wants to know. . .How Are We Doing?

How old is your child? _____yrs. _____mos.

(If you have more than one child in FITP, please answer about your oldest child)

Gender of your child: male female

Race/Ethnicity of your child: African-American Asian Hispanic/Latino
 Native American White Other

How long has your child been in the FIT Program?

less than 6 months 6 to 12 months 12 to 18 months
 18 months to 2 years 2 to 2-1/2 years 2-1/2 to 3 years

My child is now receiving services: yes no

My child is receiving services because of (check all that apply):

- Cognitive (to play, think and explore)
- Physical (to use hands and move body)
- Communication (to understand and use speech and language).
- Social and Emotional (to express feelings and relate to others).
- Adaptive (to develop eating, dressing and toileting skills)
- Medical/Health needs (including vision and hearing)



Please circle the number that best describes your family right now. For example, if the statement under 3 describes your family, circle 3. If the statement under 3 almost describes your family, but not quite, circle 2.

1. To what extent has early intervention helped your family know and understand your rights?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Early intervention has not helped me/us know about my/our family's rights		Early intervention has done a few things to help me/us know about my/our rights		Early intervention has done a good job of helping me/us know my/our family's rights		Early intervention has done an excellent job of helping me/us know about my/our family's rights

2. To what extent has early intervention helped your family effectively communicate your child's needs?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Early intervention has helped me/us effectively communicate my/our child's needs		Early intervention has done a few things to help me/us effectively communicate my/our child's needs		Early intervention has done a good job of helping me/us effectively communicate my/our child's needs		Early intervention has done an excellent job of helping me/us effectively communicate my/our child's needs

3. To what extent has early intervention helped your family be able to help your child develop and learn?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Early intervention has not helped me/us help my/our child develop and learn		Early intervention has done a few things so that I/we can help my/our child develop and learn		Early intervention has done a good job of helping me/us help my/our child develop and learn		Early intervention has done an excellent job of helping me/us help my/our child develop and learn

Comments: _____

Thank you for your time. Please return in the self addressed envelope provided or mail to: Child Development Division FITP; Attention: Sue Markley; CDD-2 north; 103 South Main St.; Waterbury, VT 05671 -2901

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.

B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	.91%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: Using the “618” data from the most recent child count – 12/1/06, there were 85 infants (compared to 70 in 2005) under the age of one served at that point in time, which is 1.29% of those children born during the most recent year of birth statistics in Vermont. The state increased its percentage of infants served under age one from 1.10% of the birth population to 1.29% of the birth population. This means that for FFY 2006, Vermont ranked 15th (tied with OK) of 55 states and territories reporting (for states and territories not serving the “at-risk” population), with Vermont .23% above the national baseline figure of 1.06%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006: Vermont exceeded its target figure and will likely keep doing so given our emphasis on seeking children who may be eligible at the earliest possible time, and in keeping with the expanded child find outlined in the IDEA of 2004. This is a high priority not only of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, but also it has been a high priority of the Vermont Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC) as well as the Child Development Division, the operating agency for the Co-Lead Agencies. Vermont continues to

conduct presentations to primary and other related referral sources, and discussed public reporting data on EIP conference calls, in order to identify children eligible for FITP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006. There is one revision in the SPP that changes the wording in the improvement activities from “state average” to “target.” This is due to the fact that the statewide average is at times higher than the target, or could be.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.

B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	3.25%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: Using the 618 data from the most recent child count 12/1/2006, there were 679 children served at that point in time between birth and age three (compared to 615 in FFY 2005). Vermont exceeded its 2006 target of 3.25%, increasing from 3.2% in 2005 to 3.45% in 2006.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006: Vermont implemented its ongoing improvement strategies and surpassed the target figure. Vermont is in the “broad eligibility” category, which consists of 24 states and territories. Vermont remains ranked as number 6 in this group, serving 3.45% of the birth to three population, which is 1.02% above the national baseline of 2.43% that was reported for all states and territories for the 12/1/06 child count. Regional EIPs successfully partnered with the Child Welfare agency to assure that all children under three with a substantiated case of child abuse and/or neglect were referred for screening/evaluation to Part C/FITP. The revised protocol for CAPTA – Part C/FITP services has been effective.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006. The revision to the SPP changes the wording in the Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources section by maintaining the major reporting categories but deleting two categories of proposed reporting (category of eligibility and referral sources) from this section for Indicator 6. The reasons for this are that this is reporting that is not required or needed in an official manner at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: 403/509 = 79.2%

403 children of the 509 children with initial IFSPs in the child count data base for the reporting period had an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within the 45 day timeline: 403/509 = 79.2%. Of the 403 children counted as timely, 165 were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006: In FFY 2004 Vermont, using a small pool of data from file reviews conducted in the monitoring process, had 39 of 51 (or **76.5%**) children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within the 45 day timeline. Vermont improved in **FFY 2005** to **79.8%** (491/615), using a much larger data pool, the child count data base. Again, using the child count data base for **FFY 2006**, there were 403 of 509 (or **79.2%**) children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted in the 45 day timeline.

The FFY 2006 rate of compliance of **79.2%** indicates that Vermont has maintained its percentage but has not met the compliance target. If the Part C proposed federal regulations

were in place during the FFY 2006 reporting period, Vermont would have been in substantial compliance for Indicator 7. The average number of days, statewide, from referral to initial IFSP meeting (inclusive of the evaluation and assessment) for this FFY 2006 reporting period was 57.26 days.

The overwhelming majority of evaluations in Vermont (489 of 509) were completed within 45 days. The 489 included 68 (13.9%) exceptional family circumstances. Of the 20 evaluations that were not completed within the 45 day timeline, the 20 were due to provider (primarily speech and language, physical and occupational therapists) availability.

The primary issue contributing to non-compliance during this reporting period was not conducting the initial IFSP meeting within the 45 day time. On further examination of the data, the reasons for not holding the initial IFSP meeting within the 45 days were due to personnel shortages (FTE), provider schedules, children placed in state custody, foster care placement changes, securing an Educational Surrogate, and school and other partner summer schedule coordination problems. The personnel shortage was exacerbated due to a large increase in referrals (with about a 50% intake rate) and the high degree of coordination it takes to provide services to families and children with multiple challenges and a lack of resources to meet their needs. There was an overall increase of 10.4% from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 for children with active IFSPs. The best practice messages to regional EIPs have conveyed that the initial IFSP meeting should include face to face meetings with the family, the regional EIP service coordinator and developmental educator, a representative from the school, as well as personnel involved in the evaluation and assessment process.

In addition to the improvement activities listed later (taken from the SPP), Vermont provided budget increases to the regional EIPs where there were compliance or potential compliance issues to address the full time equivalent personnel needs for service coordination, developmental therapy, and administrative support (due to the vastly increased effort required for federal reporting and proof of efficacy).

The one region identified with ongoing non-compliance, since 2004, has had significant challenges and we have provided substantial technical assistance. In July of 2006 the EIP for this region moved to a new agency. There were substantial compliance issues prior to the change. The new agency took some time to establish itself. The regional EIP (EIP 3) demonstrated substantial progress from FFY 2005 (47%), when the former host agency was transferring responsibilities to the new agency, to FFY 2006 (78%) when the new agency assumed responsibilities.

Based on the intense implementation of the improvement activities described below, two other regional EIPs that were identified as non-compliant in FFY 2004 came into compliance in FFY 2005 (EIP 5 and 8).

In FFY 2005 there were six regional EIPs identified as non-compliant, one came into compliance in FFY 2006 and the other four are ongoing as well as the one region, mentioned above, that has three years of non-compliance.

In FFY 2006, there are 3 new regional EIPs with non-compliance, making a total of eight regional EIPs that do not meet the targets.

We devoted substantial effort to recruit and maintain appropriately trained personnel who can travel and be available in remote areas of Vermont as well as in the urban areas. There is a lack of personnel in nearly all areas in Vermont for those specialties mentioned above. Although we are working with the Co-Lead Agency, the Department of Education, on increasing or further addressing the needs of the Part C program in grants for personnel preparation and development, more resources and incentives are needed. Even with grants to assist the state, there are still not enough personnel who actually stay in their positions for very long. There is very high turnover with these positions, with many leaving the state for more lucrative opportunities or possibly better working conditions elsewhere. This issue is not just a Part C issue, but also is an early childhood and early childhood special education issue as well.

After reviewing each regional EIP's data on all indicators, staff developed a customized technical assistance plan to address non-compliance and other issues. Staff visited with the regional EIP staff and reviewed files and administrative procedures at the same time. Certain regional EIPs were targeted with follow-up visits.

In response to Vermont's low rate of compliance in 2004-2005 on Indicator 7, the state staff conducted a statewide file review in the fall of 2007 with a particular focus on this indicator. Statewide, 183 files were reviewed. Of those 183 files, 170 files were compliant (with 48 of the 170 being exceptional family circumstances), resulting in a 93% compliance rate (170/183).

The following improvement activities were implemented and are ongoing.

- Develop file review check list for self-assessment of compliance on key indicators. **Done and used in statewide file reviews in fall of 2007, but not as a self-assessment tool yet.**
- Disseminate checklist to regional EIPs with procedures for self monitoring. **Implemented and ongoing.**
- Regional EIP 8 to do a record self assessment - if not compliant provide technical assistance. **TA is on-going and region going out to bid.**
- Provide training and technical assistance to regional EIP 3's staff and new host agency leadership on compliance issues. **Continue with monthly or more technical assistance.**
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to regional EIPs out of compliance to assure 100% compliance. **Continue individualized technical assistance, including working with providers, schools and Home Health Agency partners.**
- Annual regional goals address possible performance issues identified in regional profiles. **Regional EIPs identified goals in SFY08 grant proposal to address 2005 APR issues.**

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006: The only change to the SPP was a revision that now reports a statewide measure instead of separate regional ones. That revision was requested by OSEP in their March 15, 2006 letter to Vermont remarking on the original SPP submitted in December of 2005.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	A, B, C: 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

- 8. A. Using the child count data base as the data source for FFY 2006, 436 children exited at age three and 404 of them had an IFSP with transition steps and services, or **93%**, an increase from FFY 2005 (92%).
- 8. B. Using the same data source, the number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where LEA notification occurred was 384 of 409 or **94%**,substantial improvement from FFY 2005 (79.5%).

8. C. Using the same data source, the number of children statewide exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred was 372 of 409 or **91%**, a substantial increase from FFY 2005 (83%). Of the **372**, there were 150 children for whom exceptional family circumstances prevented the transition conference from occurring at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. There were 44 instances of non-compliance where timelines were not met and were not due to family circumstances.

There were eight instances of families who declined the transition conferences.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

- 8 A The FFY 2005 data for 8A shows Vermont at 92% compliance and in FFY 2006, the current reporting year, it shows Vermont at 93%, an improvement. On-going technical assistance to all programs about transition planning occurred, and all program improvement activities occurred. Regional EIPs that showed a low percentage of compliance in the FFY 2005 APR received more intensive technical assistance, such as regional on-site visits with staff, providers, and schools. *(See also improvement activities for 8A listed below.)*

The one regional EIP that was not in compliance in FFY 2004 came into compliance in FFY 2006. **There was one regional EIP in FFY 2005 identified as non-compliant and it came into compliance in FFY 2006.** In FFY 2006 there were two regional EIPs that were non-compliant.

- 8 B The FFY 2005 data for **8b** show Vermont at 78% compliance and in FFY 2006, the current reporting year, Vermont demonstrates 94% compliance, a significant improvement. On-going technical assistance to all regional EIPs was provided regarding transition planning, including timely notification of the LEA (in Vermont regulations it is at least six months prior to the child's third birthday). Regional EIPs that showed a low percentage of compliance in the FFY 2005 APR received more intensive technical assistance, such as regional on-site visits with staff, providers and schools. *(See also improvement activities for 8b list below)*

After a March 2007 statewide conference providing technical assistance on transition, the regional EIPs established a notification system which ensures that notifications to LEAs happen on time. However, the impact of this improvement activity may not appear until the FFY 2007 APR reporting period. There are still concerns about family consent, as some families upon entry communicate that they do not want the schools notified and staff have reported that this is a conflict in some regional EIPs, even though no detailed information is passed on for Part B child find. The fact that there are small towns, small school districts, and many political and practical concerns about education and special education discussed in town meetings, it is not a surprise that some families do not consent to early childhood special education and prefer that their names, child names, date of birth and contact information not be passed on.

In FFY 2004 all regional EIPs that were monitored were in compliance. In FY 2005, using the child count data base, there were 7 regional EIPs with non-compliance. In FFY 2006, four of the seven regional EIPs came into compliance. There was one new finding in FFY 2006 (EIP # 6).

- 8 C In the FFY 2006 child count data base, 11 of 12 regional EIPs either maintained 100% compliance or continued to make progress towards compliance. Statewide, Vermont progressed significantly from 83% compliance in FFY 2005 to 91% compliance in FFY

2006. Two regional EIPs showed slight slippage. The main reasons reported by regional EIPs for delays were due to difficulties in scheduling school personnel, FITP staff and therapeutic providers.

Regional workshops were held at the state conference in which program specific and school-specific data and problems were discussed with each region. Each regional EIP and its set of schools developed their own take-home action plans to improve their work together. In addition, phone consultation, email exchanges and site visits occurred. Planning for the 2007 APR period began as well with 4 regions and their school partners are getting targeted, comprehensive technical assistance and follow up. (See also table below.)

In FFY 2004, there were three regional EIPs with non-compliance, based on very limited data (seven files in three regional EIPs (EIP 3, 5, and 11). In FFY 2005, two of the three regional EIPs came into compliance (EIP 5 and 11). There were four regional EIPs in FFY 2005 that did not meet compliance with an additional regional EIP having ongoing non-compliance. Of these five, two came into compliance in FFY 2006. Three continued to have ongoing non-compliance – with one regional EIP out of compliance since FFY 2004. This regional EIP did demonstrate improvement from 73.7% in FFY 2005 to 88% compliance in FFY 2006.

In FFY 2006 there were no additional regional EIPs identified as non-compliant.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Vermont collaborates on the area of Transition at least monthly with the Vermont Department of Education 619 Consultant, the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC), and Vermont Parent Information Center (VPIC), and periodically with staff at the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). Nearly all transition issues are discussed jointly among Part C and Part B/619 staff so that messages to the field (regional EIPs and pre-school special education/Special Education personnel in schools) are coordinated. Below are Vermont’s improvement activities from the SPP and the current status of on-going and completed activities. These are referred to in the discussion of each sub-indicator above.

Sub-Indicators for Indicator 8	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes/Status
A B C	Revised to add: Interagency Agreement completed and submitted to OSEP 6/29/06.	Ongoing	AHS and DOE staff	Completed
A B C	Revised to add: Technical Assistance and Training on Transition occurring at program/LEA levels and statewide.	Ongoing	AHS and DOE staff	Ongoing joint customized Technical Assistance and training to prioritized, non-compliant regional EIPs and LEAs with VT Dept of Ed Ongoing development of Transition Modules to be used as an online orientation/training tool. Ongoing development and revisions of best practice resources to ensure family satisfaction, with NERRC, VPIC and NECTAC

Sub-Indicators for Indicator 8	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes/Status
				assistance.
A B C	Close-out verification of one-year corrective action plans continues in regions	Winter 2006 and ongoing through 2010	State Staff	All regional EIPs on one year corrective action plan closed-out at 100% compliance during on-site monitoring reviews.
A B C	Follow-up technical assistance provided to regions with findings of non-compliance during monitoring process to ensure 100% compliance within one year.	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Staff	C-B combined statewide Transition Conference held March 27 th of 2007 which addressed compliance and best practice with DOE and NERRC staff. Ongoing technical assistance was provided to individual regional EIPs based on rates of non-compliance, informal concerns communicated by families, providers and staff regarding on-going relationships between 619 staff and FITP.
A B C	Regional profiles used for self –assessment and data verification.	December 2005 and ongoing through 2010	State Staff	Also used to prioritize technical assistance needs (see above)
A B C	Monthly Child Count reporting form revised and data collected and analyzed	January 2006	State Staff	Completed
A B C	Statewide form for timely notification to LEA developed and implemented statewide	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Staff	Still in process. Early Intervention programs have developed forms and processes for notification.
A B C	Revised IFSP disseminated (that includes revised transition pages)	Winter 2008	State Staff	Still in process
A B C	Trainings conducted regionally/statewide for families and providers (to include new data management system; Stepping Stones workshops - transition Part C to Part B)	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Part C staff; State Part C/619 staff when appropriate	Stepping Stones, transition training for families, held in 2 Regional EIPs. More sessions of Stepping Stones are planned for community playgroups in efforts to reach more families. Statewide Transition Conference held (see above)

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006. There are no SPP revisions for FFY 2006.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006 (July 2006-June 2007): 63%

This APR reporting period for Indicator 9 marks Vermont Part C's shift from using data primarily collected and analyzed from file reviews during on-site visits (which has produced a limited pool of data), to using the child count data base (which includes data for every child) as the primary source for collecting and analyzing data. State Part C staff now systematically review annually, and on an ongoing basis, data from the 12 regional EIPs in order to determine compliance and correction of non-compliance, and progress in the Priority Areas and Indicators.

Data described in the tables below primarily reflect data gathered and analyzed from child count data base of 2005 and child count data base of 2006. For FFY 2005, data for Indicator 1, Timely Services, were collected statewide from 125 file reviews. Findings reported are *new* in FFY 2005 and do not reflect ongoing noncompliance (i.e., findings from FFY 2004 not corrected within one year).

State Part C staff have continued to conduct on-site visits and file reviews with specific regional EIPs. These on-site visits are part of Vermont Part C's cyclical monitoring process and are

conducted to: 1) ensure regional EIPs are meeting Part C federal and state requirements, 2) provide technical assistance related to any identified noncompliance, 3) verify correction of the identified noncompliance, and 4) address any other “challenges” related to practice that the regional EIP staff and/or state Part C staff have identified. The two regional EIPs reflected in the tables below received on-site visits in FFY 2005, since they were scheduled for visits based on the monitoring cycle.

During FFY 2005, Vermont Part C monitored other topical areas identified as challenging for regional EIPs during on-site monitoring visits in FFY 2003 and FFY 2004, even though all findings identified in FFY 2004 were corrected within one year (FFY 2005). State staff wanted to ensure that regional EIP staff continued to clearly document: 1) a child’s current levels of functioning in all five areas of development based on the all domain evaluation and assessment; 2) that they have provided written prior notice of the initial IFSP meeting; and 3) that they have provided parents with written parental rights and verbally discussed them, and have offered parents subsequent opportunities to discuss them and/or receive the written rights throughout their time in the Part C program. Vermont Part C staff continue to be encouraged by progress in these areas (which was further verified in fall 2007 during on-site visits to the regional EIPs). State Part C staff will continue to track data from regional EIPs to ensure maintenance in the areas of Present Levels and Prior Notice, and specifically will monitor the EIPs in the area of Parental Rights through its annual Family Outcomes survey as well in family focus forums (described under Indicator 4, Family Outcomes).

Priority Areas and Indicators

Priority Areas/Indicators	GS Component/ Monitoring Mechanism	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2005	a. # of Findings FFY 2005	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2006	% Corrected w/in 1 year
1. Timely Services	Data Review	12	2	2	100
2. Natural Environments	1. Data Review 2. On-Site Visit	12 2 of 12	0 0		
7. 45-Day Timeline	1. Data Review 2. On-Site Visit	12 2 of 12	5 0	1	20
8a. Transition Plan	1. Data Review 2. On-Site Visit	12 2 of 12	1 0	1	100
8b. Notification	1. Data Review 2. On-Site Visit	12 2 of 12	7 0	4	57
8c. Conference	1. Data Review 2. On-Site Visit	12 2 of 12	4 0	2 0	50
TOTAL			19	10	53

Other Topical Areas

Other Topical Areas	GS Component/ Monitoring Mechanism	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2005	a. # of Findings FFY2005	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2006	% Corrected w/in 1 year
Present Levels Development	On-Site Visit	2	2	2	100
Prior Notice Initial IFSP Meeting	On-Site Visit	2	2	2	100
Parental Rights	On-Site Visit	2	1	1	100
TOTAL			5	5	100

Percent of Non-Compliance Identified Through Other Mechanisms: 0

There were no findings of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms during the reporting year FFY 2005.

Total Number Findings Priority, Topical Areas and Other FFY 2005: **24**

Total Number Corrections FFY 2006: **15**

Total Corrected within 1 Year (FFY 2005-FFY 2006): 63%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Vermont:

- Set standards for identification of non-compliance, i.e., a “Finding,” and for correction of the non-compliance.
- Continued to work on full implementation of on-line, real time data management system. The system was tested in 2 regional EIPs in FFY 2005 and in FFY 2006, further revisions were made based on the piloting input and an improved understanding of additional and/or revised federal reporting requirements.
- Completed cyclical monitoring with all 12 regional EIPs in spring 2007 and initiated preliminary work on focused monitoring system. For the five regional EIPs monitored on-site during FFY 2005 and 2006, Part C staff replaced the “traditional” family survey conducted as part of the cyclical monitoring process with the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Family Outcomes survey, analyzing results for use in the on-site family focus forums. During FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, Vermont Part C staff also conducted joint, comprehensive on-site monitoring in collaboration with state staff from other family

support and child development programs (i.e., CIS) in those regional EIPs in which the agency was a “host” for other family support and child development programs.

- Continued to provide intensive technical assistance to one of the five regional EIPs monitored during FFY 2004 that continues to demonstrate ongoing non-compliance. Part C staff made at least monthly on-site visits during this reporting period to the regional EIP to, among other activities, conduct file reviews with staff and reinforce regulatory, administrative, and practice requirements.
- Developed Determination criteria and implemented Determination process with 12 regional EIPs in spring of 2007. Eleven of the twelve regional EIPs received a determination of “Needs Assistance.” The one regional EIP that has had ongoing non-compliance during the FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 reporting years (see above) was determined to be in the “Needs Intervention” category. The determination process provides the foundation for both discussions with regional EIPs and for the implementation of focused monitoring. This process has helped Part C staff to effectively plan customized technical assistance by identifying which regions need the most help and in what areas they need the help.
- Drafted “customized” technical assistance and training plans for each regional EIP and statewide TA and training plans based on the data reviewed in making spring 2007 determinations. Regional EIP plans included specific incentives, such as budget increases for additional personnel and/or personnel hours as well as funding to hire specific therapists directly.

Vermont’s rate of correction dropped in FFY 2006 to 63% from 70% in FFY 2005 (see below for revisions to the FFY 2005 APR Indicator 9). As noted previously in describing the data for findings and corrections, this is the first year that Vermont is using the child count data base as its primary source of data collection and analysis. The data for Indicator 9 in FFY 2005 reflected a combination of on-site visits to report findings, and a review of the larger child count data base to report corrections. Although the FFY 2006 percentage of correction decreased from FFY 2005, staff in FFY 2006 are more confident using the child count data base as the primary source of data, since there is a much greater pool of data to review and analyze, and it has been used already in reporting (some of the data) and thus been through an intense verification process. Corrections and findings are based on using the same source of data, rather than a combination of the two sources. The data from file reviews serve as complimentary – fidelity checks - when used in combination with the child count data base information.

Status of Vermont’s non-compliance identified in 2005 (in revised table below):

Indicator 1, Timely services: Three of four regional EIPs identified with findings in FFY 2004 did not correct in FFY 2005. During this FFY 2006 reporting period, regional EIP 3 went to 72% compliance from 50% compliance, regional EIP 4 from 73% to 90%, and regional EIP 7 to 100% from 80%. Staff are encouraged by the progress in two of the three regions and continue, as noted above, to work diligently with regional EIP 3 to bring them closer to full compliance.

Indicator 7, 45 day timelines: Three of the five regional EIPs identified with findings in FFY 2004 did not correct in FFY 2005. This is the most challenging area, besides timely correction of non-compliance. In FFY 2006, all improvement activities were vigorously implemented including, at the end of the year, when the public reporting and determinations data were available to the

CDD staff, significant financial assistance addressed non-compliance and other issues for the reporting period FFY 2007.

Indicator 8C, Transition Conference: Regional EIP 3 did not correct in FFY 2005. During FFY 2006, however, this program demonstrated 88% compliance, a significant increase from 73% compliance in FFY 2005. Again, this is the regional EIP that is receiving substantial technical assistance and additional resources. At least quarterly planned site visits were made to this program for several issues, including transition/timely transition conferences. In addition, team meetings with schools occurred and action plans were developed at the transition conference in March of 2007. Intensive, specialized follow up has occurred with schools and the regional EIP in this area consisting of meetings, surveys, discussions and a very planned out set of activities that began last spring and will be reported in the APR 2007 as well. We are just now reviewing that data.

While Vermont's regional EIPs in FFY 2006 improved significantly in all indicators except for Indicators 7 and 9 (the 45 day timeline and timely correction of identified non-compliance), there are challenges to rates of improvement that are due to a lack of appropriate resources; higher caseloads; more intense workloads; and the dramatic increase in documentation, data collection, verification, analysis and reporting. This is coupled with a decrease in federal funding for this program. In addition, some regional EIPs are so rural and small that, for example, if a regional EIP has one or two children of 20 who do not receive their services in a timely way, the program is identified as non-compliant in this area, thus placing the program into the "findings" category. This regional EIP could continue to be non-compliant while at the same time be providing high quality services.

In reviewing the FFY 2006 data, Vermont Part C staff has concluded that the initial determination process and public reporting that occurred in spring of 2007 laid a solid foundation for expectations regarding compliance and performance both at the state and regional levels. The review, reporting and determinations process as mentioned previously resulted in intensive technical assistance plans for regional EIPs. Overall, regional EIP staff pay much more attention in responding to the need for increased, accurate, and timely submission of critical data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006: Improvement activity 9 revised to delete the word "Consider." Added one improvement activity at the end, "Engage Federal and other Technical Assistance Centers (e.g. NERRC, NECTAC) to support this work." This collaboration effort is critical in many ways, and particularly in the areas of transition and support in implementing the data management system. The addition of this activity to the SPP further reinforces the importance of this ongoing collaboration.

Revisions to FFY 2005 Indicator 9

Based on conversations with and a recommendation from OSEP staff at the August 2007 OSEP Leadership Conference in Baltimore, Vermont Part C staff in this FFY 2006 revised Indicator 9 from the FFY 2005 APR to reflect the clarified definition of a “Finding” and the supporting guidance contained in the document Definitions Relevant to Indicator C-9, B-15 (8/3/07). These revisions are below.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (reporting period 7/05-6/06)	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (July 2005-June 2006): 70%

The data reported in this revision to Indicator 9 in the 2005 APR shows that 70% of findings were corrected within one year, instead of the 60% reported in the original FFY 2005 APR.

Priority Areas and Indicators

Data for FFY 2004 in the table below for Priority Areas and Indicators (with the exception of Timely Services) were collected and analyzed from file reviews (47 files) during on-site monitoring in five regional EIPs. Data for Indicator 1, Timely Services, were collected statewide from 125 file reviews. Findings reported are *new* in FFY 2004. The regional EIPs reflected in the tables below received on-site visits in FFY 2004, since they were scheduled as part of Vermont Part C’s cyclical monitoring process. Data for FFY 2005 that reports correction of findings in the five regional EIPs in the Priority Areas and Indicators, with the exception of Timely Services, were gathered and analyzed from Child Count Data Base 2005, a much larger pool of data. Data for Indicator 1, Timely Services, were collected statewide from 125 file reviews.

Vermont Part C staff monitored other topical areas they identified as challenging for regional EIPs during monitoring visits in FFY 2003. Data for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 in the table below for Topical Areas Single Service Coordinator, Present Levels of Development, Prior Notice, and Parental Rights were collected and analyzed from file reviews (47 FFY 2004, 50 FFY 2005) during on-site monitoring in the five regional EIPs.

Revised Priority Areas/Indicators Table: Indicator 9

Priority Areas/Indicators	GS Component/Monitoring Mechanism	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2004	a. # of Findings FFY 2004	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
1. Timely Services	Data Review	12	4	1	25
2. Natural Environments	1.Data Review 2.On-Site Visit	5 2 of the 5	0 0		
7. 45-Day Timeline	1.Data Review 2.On-Site Visit	5	5	2	40
8A. Transition plan	1.Data Review 2.On-Site Visit	5	0		
8B. Transition notification	1.Data Review 2.On-Site Visit	5	0		
8C. Transition Conference	1.Data Review 2.On-Site Visit	5	3	2	67
TOTAL			12	5	42

Revised Other Topical Areas Table: Indicator 9

Other Topical Areas	GS Component/Monitoring Mechanism	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2004	a. # of Findings FFY 2005	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
Single Service Coordinator	On-Site Visit	5	0		
Present Levels Development	On-Site Visit	5	5	5	100
Prior Notice Initial IFSP Meeting	On-Site Visit	5	4	4	100
Parental Rights	On-Site Visit	5	1	1	100
TOTAL			10	10	100

Revised Percent of Non-Compliance Identified Through Other Mechanisms

Other Mechanisms	GS Component/Monitoring Mechanism	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2004	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
Dispute Resolution	Data Review	1	1	1	100
TOTAL			1	1	100

There was one written complaint received in FFY 2004; it was corrected in FFY 2005

Revised corrections During FFY 2005, July 2005-June 2006

Total Number Findings Priority, Topical Areas and Other (FFY 2004):	23
Total Number Corrections (FFY 2005):	16
Total Corrected within 1 Year:	70%

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: There were no signed written complaints for the Part C program during this reporting period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Does not apply since there were no signed written complaints during this time period that involved the Part C program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

There were no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator during this reporting period.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: There were no requests and no adjudications during this time period for the Part C program.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The Part C SPP Improvement Activities continue with Part B; however there has been no activity related to the Part C program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

There were no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator during this reporting period.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	Vermont will coordinate with and support Part B targets

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: There have been no Part C requests for hearings that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Does not apply during this reporting period.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

There were no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator during this reporting period.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	Assist Part B in promoting mediation and in reaching their targets

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006: There were no mediation requests for Part C that resulted in mediation agreements during this time period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Does not apply during this reporting period.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006

There were no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator during this reporting period.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Please see the section that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision
--

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data (618 and State performance plan and annual performance report) are:
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel and dispute resolution; and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met). |
|--|

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006 <small>(reporting period 7/06 – 6/07)</small>	100%

Actual Target Data for 2006: 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Vermont reached the goal of timely and accurate submissions and reporting to OSEP and others. Vermont continues to work on having an electronic data management system that is more efficient than the current system, which is primarily administered by hand.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for FFY 2006: There are no revisions to Indicator 14 in the Part C SPP at this time.

Table 4 –

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 4

REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART C, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
FFY 2006 (July 2006 through June 2007)

PAGE 1 OF 1

OMB NO.: 1820-0678

FORM EXPIRES: 11/30/2009

STATE: _____

SECTION A: Written, signed complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	0
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	0
(a) Reports with findings	0
(b) Reports within timeline	0
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	0
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0
SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	0
(3.1) Resolution meetings (For States adopted Part B Procedures)	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) (For all states)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline SELECT timeline used {30 day Part C, 30 day Part B, or 45 day Part B}	DNA 0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline (only applicable if using Part B due process hearing procedures).	DNA 0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	0